



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,868	07/21/2004	Jean-Pierre Devidal	021305-00201	8688
4372 7590 04/03/2008 ARENT FOX LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER ALSTRUM ACEVEDO, JAMES HENRY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2008 ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com
IPMatters@arentfox.com
Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/500,868

Applicant(s)

DEVIDAL ET AL.

ExaminerJAMES H. ALSTRUM
ACEVEDO**Art Unit**

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3, 7-8, and 10-16 are pending. Claims 10-16 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.¹ **Claims 1-3 and 7-8 are under consideration in the current office action.** Applicants previously cancelled claims 5-6 and 9. Applicants have newly cancelled claim 4. Applicants have amended claim 1. Receipt and consideration of Applicants' amended claims and remarks/arguments, submitted on December 27, 2007 are acknowledged. All rejections not explicitly maintained in the instant office action have been withdrawn per Applicants' claim amendments.

Moot Rejections/objections

All rejections and/or objections of claim 4 cited in the previous office action mailed on May 7, 2007 **are moot**, because said claim has been cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 10-16 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 1/20/2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1616

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Applicant Claims
2. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
3. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 **remain rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode et al. (DE 19606433; based on the English abstract and translation) in view of Rhoades (US 2001/0018061), Laughlin (U.S. 2002/0000237), Weber et al. (US 2002/0058952) and/or Yu et al. (5,962,526) for the reasons of record, which have been restated below.

¹ Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on January 20, 2006.

Applicant Claims

Applicants claim a method for the treatment of an area of human skin comprising the steps of (i) abrading a portion of the stratum corneum (i.e. the outermost layer of skin) followed by (ii) spraying a pressurized liquid onto the area to be treated by means of a spray nozzle and sucking the sprayed liquid from the skin by means of a conduit in communication with a vacuum pump, wherein the liquid comprises water or saline (claim 2) or at least one additive (claim 3), wherein the spraying step comprises spraying a liquid at a maximum pressure such that there is no risk of breaking the skin at a pressure of between 10 and 25 bar (claim 4), wherein the suction step is performed by reducing pressure of a volume surrounding the treated area of skin (claim 7), and/or further comprising the steps of (iii) filtering the liquid removed from the sucking step and (iv) recycling it.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Bode discloses a device using a pneumatic or hydraulic pressure medium for applying a treatment product in the form of a cream, liquid, or gas to the required skin area via an application jet. The pressure of the pressure medium can be adjusted between 0 and 8 bar, in a number of discrete steps, with the treatment product mixed with the pressure medium, or applied to the skin before application of the jet. A schematic of the device disclosed by Bode, comprising a nozzle (137), is also present in the abstract. It is noted that liquid cosmetics inherently contain water. Creams also inherently contain additives, which is interpreted as being anything other than the active compound, including solvents, such as water.

Rhoades teaches a composition including a base and a plurality of abrasive particles, an apparatus suitable for contacting localized areas of human skin, and a method including

applying a composition to an area of human skin, the composition comprising a base and a plurality of abrasive particles, and manipulating the composition over the area of human skin with a handle-operated instrument (abstract).

Rhoades teaches in [0004] that microdermabrasion (e.g., microexfoliation, particle skin resurfacing) is a technique in skin care in which a controlled exfoliation of the skin is performed to improve and remove skin abnormalities. A typical microdermabrasion machine consists of a compressor to project inert crystals of corundum through a tube into a hand piece across the skin with variable pressure while the hand piece is in contact with the skin. This induces an abrasion action, which removes the top layer of skin. At the same time, through another tube within the hand piece, the used corundum and abraded skin are vacuumed into another container for disposal. The removal of the outer layer of skin induces the human body to produce a new layer of skin, which is believed to improve the skin subject to treatment, including the appearance of wrinkles, acne, scars, age spots, damaged skin, etc [0013].

Rhoades teaches that a principal component of his invented composition includes a moisturizer, which includes humectants, such as glycerin, alpha hydroxy acids, etc. [0014]. Suitable moisturizers may be in the form of liquids, creams gels, pastes, and emollients. Rhoades' invented compositions may be applied with Rhoades invented apparatus, described in [0031].

Laughlin teaches a system for coating human skin, a chemical composition, such as a cosmetic or medical formulation, is uniformly coated over the entire body or selected parts of the body of the person being coated (abstract).

Laughlin teaches that the final element of this invention is recovery, or filtering, of residual composition. This feature greatly enhances the utility of the invention because it allows the system to be self-contained in an indoor environment and promotes a more environmentally friendly process. One configuration of the recovery system is shown in FIG. 5 [0210].

Yu teaches a composition and method for enhancing therapeutic effects of topically applied agents are disclosed. The cosmetic or therapeutic composition may include one or more of cosmetic or pharmaceutical agents present in a total amount of from 0.01 to 40 percent and one or more of hydroxycarboxylic acids or related compounds present in a total amount of from 0.01 to 99 percent by weight of the total composition. The cosmetic and pharmaceutical agents may include age spots, wrinkles and keratoses removing agents; vitamins; aloes; sun screens; tanning, depigmenting and shampooing agents; other dermatological agents, etc. The hydroxycarboxylic acids and related compounds include organic alpha and beta hydroxycarboxylic acids, alpha and beta ketocarboxylic acids and salts thereof. Topical application of the cosmetic or therapeutic composition has been found to achieve a substantial increase in cosmetic or therapeutic effect of the active ingredient in humans and domesticated animals (abstract). Hydroxycarboxylic acids are additives.

Yu teaches that any hydroxyacid and related compound may be used as an additive in a combination composition to enhance percutaneous penetration or the therapeutic efficacy of cosmetic and pharmaceutical agents (col. 6, lines 27-30).

Yu teaches that the therapeutic compositions are prepared in solution form by dissolution of at least one hydroxyacid and a cosmetic or pharmaceutical agent with solvents including water or other pharmaceutically acceptable vehicle (col. 6, lines 63-67 and col. 4, line 1). The

therapeutic compositions may also be prepared in cream or ointment form by conventional mixing of a therapeutic solution of Yu's invention with an appropriate cream or ointment base (col. 7, lines 6-12). Therapeutic compositions in the form of a gel or spray may also be formulated (col. 7, lines 15-16).

Yu teaches in the section entitled "Test Results" of the treatment of various conditions, including dry skin, psoriasis, age spots, wrinkles, keratoses, pigmented skin lesions, and acne. The tables presented within this section all demonstrated that the inclusion of hydroxyacid additives within therapeutic and/or cosmetic compositions resulted in moderate, but in most cases significant or complete improvement of the treated condition.

Weber teaches tissue resurfacing using biocompatible materials using a device comprising a vacuum line near the delivery tip which may be used to remove excess materials or reaction-products that bind up on the surface of the skin (title, abstract). The vacuum line is comprised of an opening near the tip connected to a vacuum pump via a cable ([0034]-[0035]). A vacuum pump connected via a cable reads on "a conduit in communication with a vacuum pump."

***Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

Bode lacks the teaching of a method utilizing a sprayer or other device that comprises a conduit in communication with a vacuum pump to suck up sprayed liquid from the skin. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Weber. Bode lacks the teaching of a method of treating comprising the steps consisting of filtering the liquid and recycling (i.e. reusing) it. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Laughlin. Bode lacks the teaching of a method of

treatment wherein the *stratum corneum*, the outer layer of skin, is abraded. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Rhoades. Bode lacks the disclosure of liquid comprising water or saline and/or at least one additive used in a method of treatment. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Yu.

***Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)***

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to combine the teachings of Bode and Rhoades, because both references teach methods and/or devices for treating the skin or applying compositions intended for the treatment of skin. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Rhoades with those of Bode, because the skin microexfoliation (i.e. abrasion of the stratum corneum) resulting from application of Rhoades' composition would promote the improvement of undesirable skin aesthetics by inducing the growth of a new outer layer of skin in the treated area. It would have been apparent to a skilled artisan that it is desirable to apply Rhoades' composition and exfoliate the outer layer of skin as an initial step in skin treatment, because this would promote the growth of a new layer of skin and the improvement of undesirable skin appearance. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have had a reasonable expectation of success upon combination of the prior art references, because Bode's device is designed to apply treatment products to areas of the skin and Rhoades' compositions are designed for skin treatments.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to combine the teachings of Bode and Yu, because Bode teaches a device for applying a treatment product, including products in the form of a cream or liquid, to an area of the skin and Yu teaches cosmetic/pharmaceutical compositions which may be topically applied to the skin. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Bode and Yu, because Yu's compositions, which may be topically applied, were shown to achieve a substantial increase in cosmetic or therapeutic effect of the active ingredient in humans and domesticated animals and Bode's device was designed to apply a treatment product to the skin. For these reasons a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have had a reasonable expectation of success.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to combine the teachings of Bode and Yu with the teachings of Laughlin, because both Bode and Laughlin teach systems intended for application to the skin and Yu teaches a cosmetic composition for application to the skin. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the steps of filtering and recovery of the residual composition in Bode's device to promote a more environmentally friendly process. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success upon combination of the prior art references, because all these references are in the cosmetic art, Bode and Laughlin's inventions pertain to devices/systems for the application of compositions to the skin, and Yu teaches a cosmetic formulation for application to the skin.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Weber with the combined teachings of Bode, Rhoades, Laughlin, and Yu (“BRLY combination”), because all the inventors teach methods, devices, and/or compositions used in treating the skin. The BRLY combination effectively teaches the desirability of recovering or filtering residual composition used in a method of treating the skin. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to utilize a system or device that contained a vacuum pump to remove debris liquid resulting from the methods of the BRLY combination, because vacuum systems are routinely used to clean up debris. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention that a vacuum source, such as taught by Weber, could “suck up” liquid, if applied to said liquid. Because it has been demonstrated above that the inclusion of a vacuum source in a device used to treat the skin is desirable, and both common sense and common knowledge in the art would recognize that the application of vacuum to an area having a liquid would result in said liquid being “sucked up”, an ordinary skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success upon combination of Weber’s teaching with the teachings of the BRLY combination. Regarding the limitation that the liquid be sprayed at a pressure between 10-25 bar, Bode teaches the use of a liquid pressure of 8 bar. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to modify the liquid pressure to maximize sub-cutaneous drug delivery; because liquid pressure is a result effective parameter in the subcutaneous delivery of actives by application of a jet of liquid (i.e. pressurized liquid). Applicants have not asserted any unexpected properties resulting from the use of a spray pressure of 10-25 bar. Thus, absent a showing of unexpected result, vis-à-vis the closes prior art, the claimed invention, as a whole,

would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because the combined teachings of the prior art is fairly suggestive of the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traversed the instant rejection by arguing that allegedly it would not have been *prima facie* obvious to use a spray pressure of 10-25 bar in a method of treating an area of the skin, because the maximum pressure taught by Bode is 8 bar and allegedly there is no motivation or suggestion to increase the spray pressure approximately three fold to the upper limit of Applicants' claimed pressure range.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants' traversal arguments. Pressure is generally a result effective parameter in a spray device. Thus, modification of pressure is a something which an ordinary skilled artisan would routinely do to obtain the most effective method. A spray pressure of 8 bar is sufficiently close to a pressure of 10 bar for an ordinary skilled artisan to conceive a pressure of 10 bar as a reasonable modification in spray pressure. Furthermore, Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected results or claimed that a pressure of 10-25 bar conveys any unexpected results in the practice of the claimed pressure. Therefore, the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because the combined teachings of the prior art is fairly suggestive of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 **remain rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karasiuk (US 2003/0097139), Bode et al. (DE 19606433; based on the English abstract and translation), Weber et al. (US 2002/0058952) and/or Yu et al. (5,962,526) for the reasons of record, which have been restated in the instant office action.

Applicant Claims

Applicants' claims have been described above in the instant office action.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

The teachings of Bode, Yu, and Weber are already of record and have been restated above in the instant office action. Karasiuk's teachings are already of record and are restated below.

Karasiuk teaches a microdermabrasion system and method of use for exfoliating skin cells from the external surface of skin (i.e. abrading the stratum corneum), wherein the device is adapted to flow one or more liquids through a chamber provided in the device, wherein upon application of vacuum, fluids are drawn up through the chamber and applied to the skin and a portion of the skin is drawn into the chamber and brought into contact with an abrasive member (title; abstract; claims 20-24). The fluids are contained with a reservoir and are delivered via the tip of the device [0017]. The device also includes a collection reservoir connected to a vacuum source, optionally with a **filter inline between the collection reservoir and the vacuum source** [0018]. Vacuum surrounding the perimeter of the abrasive member can be used to collect microabraded skin particles downstream from the abrasive member and from all locations

Art Unit: 1616

surrounding the abrasive member (this would obviously also collect sprayed liquid) [0022]. The device contains an opening that is in communication with a vacuum source via a vacuum line [0046]. Abrasive particles used in Karasiuk's method may be used together with lotions, vitamins, and/or other skin treatment fluids to be applied to the skin or with other fluid carriers [0050]-[0051]. Advantageously, since the flow of fluids surrounds the area of skin being microabraded, the skin is both pretreated and post-treated with the vitamins, lotions, etc. contained in the reservoir 70. Pretreatment can soften the area of skin treatment to be microabraded, thereby rendering exfoliation more complete and easier to accomplish with less trauma to the skin tissues left behind, while post-treatment helps to reduce streaking and redness of the skin tissues left behind [0055].

Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)

Karasiuk lacks the teaching of a nozzle and specific pressure of a sprayed liquid. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Bode. Karasiuk lacks the express teaching of a fluid (i.e. liquid) being water or aqueous saline. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Yu. Karasiuk lacks the express teaching of a vacuum pump. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Weber.

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)

It would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Karasiuk, Bode, Weber, and Yu, because all references are within the same field of skin treatment methods and compositions, utilizing compositions comprising pharmaceuticals

Art Unit: 1616

and/or cosmetics (Bode and Yu) and devices for the treatment of skin (Karasiuk, Bode, and Weber). An ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Karasiuk's device to spray liquid to affect (i.e. adjust the flow of fluids) to improve the pre- and post-treatment of skin with vitamins, lotions, and other skin treatment fluids taught by Karasiuk, because Bode's teachings enable one to deliver active agents, such as in the form of a liquid or cream, subcutaneously without the use of needles. Yu sets forth that the art recognizes that suitable skin treatment formulations include aqueous formulations having dissolved therein additives, such as penetration enhancers, in addition to actives. An ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to utilize formulations, such as those taught by Yu, because this are suitable for the treatment of skin and Karasiuk teaches fluids comprising vitamins, lotions, and other skin treatments. It would have been obvious to an ordinary skilled artisan to use a vacuum pump as a source of vacuum, because common sense and common knowledge in the art indicates that vacuum pumps are a source of vacuum (Weber). An ordinary skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success upon combination of the prior art references, because the art recognizes (1) the use of pressurized fluids to deliver pharmaceutical or cosmetic agents; (2) microdermabrasion exfoliates skin (i.e. abrades the stratum corneum); (3) aqueous solutions are suitable for skin treatment; and (4) vacuum pumps are well-known sources of vacuum. Regarding the limitation that the liquid be sprayed at a pressure between 10-25 bar, Bode teaches the use of a liquid pressure of 8 bar. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to optimize the liquid pressure to maximize sub-cutaneous drug delivery; because liquid pressure is a result effective parameter in the subcutaneous delivery of actives by application of a jet of liquid (i.e. pressurized liquid). Therefore the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie*

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because the combined teachings of the prior art is fairly suggestive of the claimed invention.

Other Matter

It is noted that it is unclear what condition or disease is being treated by Applicants' claimed method. The Examiner respectfully requests Applicants' clarify what is being treated by the claimed method.

Conclusion

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 are rejected. No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Alstrum-Acevedo whose telephone number is (571) 272-5548. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-6:30, with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 1616

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J.H.A.-A.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616